

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the arguments presented below.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-25 are pending.

The drawings were objected to.

Claims 1, 11, and 24 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory double-patenting over U.S. Application No. 10/750,415.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 2-25, 12-15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0212916 of Ito, et al. ("Ito").

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ito in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,854,839 of Chen, et al. ("Chen").

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 11-16, 18-19, and 25 were amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims do not add new matter.

Response to Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for failure to show the "BORSCHT" functions of claim 25. Claim 25 has been amended. In particular, claim 25 now includes the language "wherein the electronic device performs one or more BORSCHT functions."

The Examiner is referred to the arguments presented below with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of claim 25. In general, applicant submits that "BORSCHT" functions are the functions performed by subscriber line interface circuits (SLIC) and that various SLIC embodiments are set forth at

Figures 3, 17, 20, and 32. In view of the amendment to claim 25, applicant respectfully submits that the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Response to Non-statutory double-patenting rejection

Claims 1, 11, and 24 were provisionally rejected over claim 19 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/750,415.

A terminal disclaimer in the present case is not warranted at this time. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the provisional non-statutory double-patenting rejection until such a time as co-pending application 10/750,415 has issued or at least been allowed.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 25 was objected under 35 U.S.C., first paragraph due to the use of the language "BORSCHT" functions. The Examiner has stated "in general, no such functions are actually disclosed and/or taught".

Claim 25 has been amended to read as follows:

25. The apparatus of claim 24, *wherein the electronic device performs one or more BORSCHT functions.*

(Claim 25, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Applicant submits that there is ample support for amended claim 25. "BORSCHT" is a well-known acronym in the field of telephony and is associated with the functions performed by subscriber line interface circuits (SLIC). The acronym is defined at page 17, lines 14-17 of the Specification and refers to Battery feed, Overvoltage protection, Ring, Supervision, Codec, Hybrid, and Test functions. Each of these functions is described with respect to the operation of a SLIC from p. 17, line 18 through p. 18, line of the Specification. In addition, various embodiments of SLICs are illustrated in Figures 3, 17, 20, and 32.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection has been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections

Claims 2-5, 12-15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejected the claims for a lack of nexus between the introduced limitation and body of parent claims.

Applicant believes that the claim amendments have addressed the Examiner's stated concerns. Accordingly, applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-24 were rejected as being anticipated by Ito. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-24 are not anticipated by Ito. For example, Ito *does not teach or disclose dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter during the transition to control the transition toward the second supply level.*

In contrast, claim 1 includes the language:

1. A method comprising:
controlling a transition of a power supply from providing a first supply level toward providing a second supply level for a device; and
dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter during the transition to control the transition toward the second supply level.

(Claim 1, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Similar arguments may be made with respect to claims 11 and 24:

11. An electronic device comprising:
a supply level controller coupled to control a variable power supply to supply power at a supply level for the electronic device;
a transition-to-target controller coupled to control the supply level controller to control the variable power supply to supply power at approximately a first supply level for the electronic device and to control a transition of the power from approximately the first supply level toward a second supply level prior to controlling the variable power supply to supply power at approximately the second supply level for the electronic device; and
a controller parameter(s) controller coupled to control one or more power supply controller parameters for the supply level controller dynamically during the transition from the first supply level toward the second supply level.

(Claim 11, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

24. An apparatus comprising:

means for controlling a variable power supply to supply power at approximately a first supply level for an electronic device;

means for controlling the variable power supply to control a transition of the power from approximately the first supply level toward a second supply level prior to controlling the variable power supply to supply power at approximately the second supply level for the electronic device; and

means for dynamically controlling a value of one or more power supply controller parameters during the transition.

(Claim 24, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Thus applicant submits claims 1, 11, and 24 are not anticipated. Given that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-23 depend from claim 11, and claim 25 depends from claim 24, applicant submits claims 2-10 and 12-25 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection

Claim 25 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Chen. Applicant submits that Chen does not make up for the deficiencies of Ito and that amended claim 25 depends from claim 24. Thus claim 25 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Accordingly, claims 1-25 should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (512) 858-9910.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 20, 2006

William D. Davis
William D. Davis
Reg. No. 38,428

DAVIS & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 1093
Dripping Springs, TX 78620